REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,617,312 to <u>Iura et al.</u> (herein "<u>Iura</u>") in view of U.S. patent 5,317,140 to <u>Dunthorn</u>. That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now further recites "determining whether the predetermined object is within a predetermined distance from the plane of the display". The other independent claims are similarly amended. That claimed subject matter is fully supported by the original specification, see for example step S103 in Figure 6 in the present specification and the corresponding discussion in the present specification at page 12, lines 12-21.

According to the claimed invention, coordinates of a predetermined object inserted above a plane of a display can be detected. One feature in the claimed invention is to determine when an object is close enough to a plane so that its motion can be detected. That motion can then later be used to determine coordinates of the predetermined object. The claimed invention also utilizes two cameras at respective corners of a display to calculate coordinates of the predetermined object.

Features recited in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

First, applicants note <u>Iura</u> does not disclose or suggest "determining whether the predetermined object is within a predetermined distance from the plane of the display" as now specifically recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in the other independent claims.

In that respect applicants also note <u>Dunthorn</u> does not disclose or suggest the abovenoted feature of "determining whether the predetermined object is within a predetermined
distance from the plane of the display". <u>Dunthorn</u> was merely cited to disclose the use of
cameras at respective corners of a display device and to determine the position of an object
based on triangulation. Thus, <u>Dunthorn</u> does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of
<u>Iura</u>.

Moreover, applicants submit the primary applied art to <u>Iura</u> not only does not disclose or suggest the above-noted claim feature, but actually teaches away from that claim limitation. Thus, <u>Iura</u> could not even have been modified to meet the above-noted claim feature.

<u>Iura</u> is directed to a different type of device than in the claimed invention. As shown for example in Figure 2 <u>Iura</u> mounts a single camera 100 at the front of a computer, and not at a corner of a display.

However, <u>Iura</u> has no operation and would have no reason to determine when an object is a predetermined distance from a plane of a display. <u>Iura</u> utilizes the front facing camera 100 to look at the motion of a person, but in <u>Iura</u> a motion relative to a plane of a display is completely irrelevant. Therefore, <u>Iura</u> does not disclose or suggest, and actually teaches away from, "determining whether the predetermined object is within a predetermined distance from the plane of the display" and detecting an object's position "while the predetermined object is within a predetermined distance from the plane" of the display.

In such ways, <u>Iura</u> does not teach or suggest features clarified in the claims, and actually teaches away from such features. Thereby, <u>Iura</u> could not have been modified in any manner to meet the claim limitations regardless of any disclosure in <u>Dunthorn</u>.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as written distinguish over the applied art.

Application No. 10/717,456 Reply to Office Action of October 31, 2006

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

JJK:SNS\rle

I:\ATTY\SNS\24'S\244641\244641us-AF.DOC

James J. Kulbaski Attorney of Record Registration No. 34,648

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423